



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—NOTES AND QUERIES ON UTOPIAS IN PLAUTUS.

Rohde¹ has traced the development of prose romances in Greek from erotic narrative and from fanciful stories of adventure by land and sea; the latter element in the compound he derives from a peculiar sort of "Reisedichtung", traces of which he finds in the Odyssey, in the adventures of the Argonauts, in the poem of Aristeas, in accounts of travel by Pytheas, Ctesias, and others. In the Hellenistic period ethnographic fiction, as Rohde styles it, became popular: it formed an older stratum in the legends about Alexander attributed to Callisthenes; it served as a framework for the construction of political and philosophical Utopias. Such Utopias appear as a Meropian land in Theopompus's fancy—perhaps under the influence of Plato's Atlantis—, as a country of the Hyperboreans in the fiction of Hecataeus of Abdera, as various happy islands or islands of the blessed located in the north and west, less often in the south and east; fabulous peoples with more or less fanciful names inhabit such regions—the Attacores in the tale of Amometus, the Ophiocani in a story ascribed to one Timocles. The *Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφὴ* of Euhemerus, and the fantastic adventures of Iambulus are reported in some detail by Diodorus. In the second century after Christ such fanciful stories became the subject of a brilliant parody, Lucian's *Ἀληθείς Ἰστορίαι*.

It is apparent from the wide range of experiences in Lucian's parody that the extent of such fiction was much greater than appears from extant fragments and summaries of the Hellenistic period. That the same forces which produced this fiction had some effect upon other types of literature in the same period is a reasonable supposition which has already been confirmed to some extent in the case of comedy. The *Schlaraffenland-motif* of Greek folk-tales, which reappears in descriptions of the islands of the blessed and of other Utopias of this period, has been detected in the old Attic comedy, and in the fragmentary remains

¹ Der griech. Roman² 178–309 (marg., pp. 167–287).

of the later comedy.¹ To the reproductions of this later comedy by Plautus and Terence we should naturally turn for more complete evidence.

I.

Rohde has himself revealed in three passages of a single play of Plautus more or less clear reminiscences of such fiction, or at least of the forces which produced it. The first of these passages (*Trinummus* 549) is very general:² the slave in the play is attempting to prevent the giving away of a farm which constitutes the sole asset of his spendthrift master; he describes the farm as fatally affecting not only the crops and live-stock but the human occupants; Philto, the prospective owner of the farm, retorts:

sed istest ager profecto, ut te audiui loqui,
malos in quem omnis publice mitti decet,
sicut fortunatorum memorant insulas,
quo cuncti qui aetatem egerint caste suam
convenient; contra istoc detrudi maleficos
aequom videtur, qui quidem istius sit modi.

It is obvious that this reference may come from the common store of folk-notions without the intervention of any such literary expression of the idea as, for example, Lucian parodies later (*V. H.* II 5). Indeed the passage shows clearly that Philemon³ was not inspired by the author of any work which Lucian may be satirizing in his description of the islands of the blessed: for Lucian's parody includes a τῶν ἀσβεβῶν χῶρος (*V. H.* II 17, 29), knowledge of which would have made unnecessary a contrast with the *fortunatorum insulae* and would have led rather to a direct comparison with such *infortunatorum insulae* as are suggested by Lucian's description.

A suggestion of influence exerted upon Philemon's *Θησαυρός* by any work attacked in Lucian's parody may seem uncalled for; especially when the idea in question is almost a commonplace. But

¹ Zielinski, *Die Märchenkomödie in Athen*. Rohde, op. cit. 210 n. (marg.) p. 192, n. 4), who refers to Bergk, *Comm. de rel. com. Att.*, p. 140. For the motif in folk-tale cf. Crusius, *Verh. d. Versamml. deutsch. Philolog. u. Schulmänner* 40 (1889) 36 ff.

² Rohde, op. cit. 214, n. 1 (marg., p. 200, n. 1).

³ It is of course by no means certain that the passage is from the Greek original, Zemmrich has shown the universality of the conception of islands of the dead in his dissertation: *Die Toteninseln und verwandte geographische Mythen* (Leiden, 1891). But I know of no positive evidence that points to any native source for the idea as it appears in Republican literature.

the necessity for treating seriously such a suggestion is apparent when we note, in the same scene of the same play, what appears to be a very distinct connection between a source of Lucian's parody and, presumably, Plautus's Greek original.¹ Lucian (V. H. I 24) says of the inhabitants of the moon: *τῇ μέντοι γε γαστρὶ ὅσα πῆρα χρῶνται τιθέντες ἐν αὐτῇ ὅσων δέονται. ἀνοικτὴ γὰρ αὐτοῖς αὕτη καὶ πάλιν κλειστή ἐστίν. ἔντερον δὲ οὐδὲ ἦπαρ ἐν αὐτῇ φαίνεται ἢ τοῦτο μόνον, ὅτι δασεῖα πᾶσα ἔντοσθεν καὶ λάσιός ἐστιν, ὥστε καὶ τὰ νεογνά, ἐπειδὰν ῥιγῶσιν, ἐς ταύτην ὑποδύεται. In vs. 422 of the Trinummus, Philto, observing that the spendthrift son has sold his house in his father's absence, remarks:*

*pol opino adfinis noster aedis vendidit;
pater quom peregre veniet, in portast locus,
nisi forte in ventrem filio conrepserit.*

The situation is the reverse of that in Lucian. Again the source from which Philemon draws may be only general folk-notions, rather than contemporary fiction.²

The third passage in the Trinummus shows clearer traces of Utopian fiction, and suggests a literary tradition.³ The requirements of the plot make it necessary to dress up an impostor who pretends to be bringing two letters from the absent father; unfortunately the father returns just as the impostor is approaching to carry out his trick; the father sees through the trick and amuses himself at the expense of the impostor, who is quite unconscious of the father's identity. In the course of the cross-questioning the father inquires what places he has visited in his travels, during which he pretends to have met the father; the *sycophanta* replies (933 ff.):

omnium primum in Pontum advecti ad Arabiam terram sumus.

—eho an etiam Arabiast in Ponto?—est: non illa ubi tus gignitur, sed ubi apsinthium fit ac cunila gallinacea.

—sed quid ais? quo inde isti porro?—si animum advortes, eloquar. ad caput amnis, quod de caelo exoritur sub solio Iovis.

—sub solio Iovis?—ita dico.—e caelo?—atque medio quidem.

eho an etiam in caelum escendisti?—immo horiola advecti sumus

usque aqua advorsa per amnem.—eho an tu etiam vidisti Iovem?

—alii di isse ad villam aiebant servis depromptum cibum.

deinde porro . . . —deinde porro nolo quicquam praedices.

¹ Rohde, op. cit. 209, n. (marg., p. 192, n. 4).

² Rohde, l. c., compares the *κῶων θαλαττία* described in Aelian, Hist. Anim. I 17.

³ Rohde, op. cit. 256, n. 1 (marg., p. 238, n. 1) refers to the passage as an example of "Lügenberichte von Reisenden".

Rohde is doubtless wisely conservative in seeing in this passage only a parody of the τῶν πλωϊζομένων ψευδολογία καὶ τερατεία; he implies, perhaps, that there is no connection with contemporary literature. Possibly I am misled by the Euhemeristic turn at the end of the passage—Juppiter as slave-master dispensing rations at his farm—but in any case there are a few features that remind one of Euhemerus's narrative. Diodorus (V 41 ff.) reports: περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν μεσημβρίαν νήσων τῶν ἐν Ὠκεανῷ τῆς Ἀραβίας τῆς πρὸς ἀνατολὴν κεκλιμένης καὶ προσοριζούσης τῇ καλουμένῃ Κεδρωσίᾳ. (4) ταύτης δὲ κατὰ τὰς ἐσχатиὰς τῆς παρωκεανίτιδος χώρας κατ' ἀντικρὺ νῆσοι κείνται πλείους, (42, 4) ἔχει δὲ ἡ Παγχαία καθ' αὐτὴν πολλὰ τῆς ἱστορικῆς ἀναγραφῆς ἄξια (5) πόλις δ' ἐστὶν ἀξιόλογος ἐν αὐτῇ, προσαγορευομένη μὲν Πανάρα, εὐδαιμονία δὲ διαφέρουσα. οἱ δὲ ταύτην οἰκοῦντες καλοῦνται μὲν ἰκέται τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Τριφυλίου, (6) ἀπὸ δὲ ταύτης τῆς πόλεως ἀπέχει σταδίου ὡς ἐξήκοντα ἱερὸν Διὸς Τριφυλίου, κείμενον μὲν ἐν χώρᾳ πεδιάδι, (43, 2) πλησίον γὰρ τοῦ τεμένους ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐκπίπτει τηλικαύτῃ τῷ μέγεθος πηγῇ γλυκέος ὕδατος ὥστε ποταμὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς γίνεσθαι πλωτόν. (44, 1) ὁ δὲ ναὸς ὑπῆρχεν ἀξιόλογος (2) ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ναοῦ δρόμος κατεσκευάστο, (3) ἐπ' ἐσχάτῳ δὲ τοῦ δρόμου τὰς πηγὰς ἔχει λίβρωσ ἐκχεομένας ὁ προειρημένους ποταμός. ὀνομάζεται δὲ ὁ ποταμὸς οὗτος ἡλίου ὕδαρ. (5) τὸ δ' ὑποκείμενον πεδίον ἐπὶ σταδίου διακοσίου καθιερωμένον ἐστὶ τοῖς θεοῖς, μετὰ δὲ τὸ προειρημένον πεδίον ὄρος ἐστὶν ὑψηλόν, καθιερωμένον μὲν θεοῖς, ὀνομαζόμενον δὲ Οὐρανοῦ δίφρος καὶ τριφύλιος Ὀλυμπος. (46, 3) μυθολογοῦσι δ' οἱ ἱερεῖς τὸ γένος αὐτοῖς ἐκ Κρήτης ὑπάρχειν, ὑπὸ Διὸς ἡγμένοις εἰς τὴν Παγχαίαν, ὅτε κατ' ἀνθρώπους ὦν ἐβασίλευε τῆς οἰκουμένης. There is to be sure little direct connection between the "water of the sun" that becomes a navigable river with only a plain separating it from a mountain called the δίφρος of Uranus (obviously also the seat of Triphylian Zeus), and the river in our passage that rises from the *solium* of Juppiter in mid-heaven; but there is enough resemblance to warrant the suggestion that Philemon, if we may safely ascribe the verses to him, was as likely to be drawing from a literary source as from any "ἐμπορικὰ διηγήματα".

2

One other passage in the same play is recognized as a purely Utopian reference, although the interpretation of it has been necessarily vague. The verse in question (928) immediately precedes the passage which has just been discussed. The father, before asking about the travels of the impostor, inquires where

he left Charmides, from whom he pretends to be bringing letters. The question and the answer are given thus in the Palatine MSS:—sed ipse ubi est?—pol illum reliqui ad Rhadamantem in Cecropia insula.

The variations in B are slight, but important in one respect: that MS reads *ihadamante* and *Cecropio*. The verse as it stands is impossible: it exceeds the limits of a trochaic septenarius. Efforts to emend it were put forth early in the history of modern study of the text. Meursius, regardless of metrical difficulties, simply changed *Cecropia* to *Cercopia* and left the verse hypermetrical; the idea in this reading was carried out better by Guyet, who, accepting *Cercopia*, at the same time expunged *insula*, making the line a satisfactory septenarius. The same idea was expressed in the reading of Fritzsche (*Analecta Plautina*, 9–10), who following Bothe's emendation of *Rhadamantem* to *Rhadamam* (once approved by Ritschl on the analogy of *Calcham* for *Calchantem*: *Opusc.* V 343 = *Prolegg.* LXXXVII, cf. *Opusc.* II 491, n. *Trin.² praef. LXIX), changed *Cecropia* to *Cercopum* and kept *insula* in the verse. Of recent editors Goetz-Schoell in their smaller edition keep the MS-reading, marking the verse as corrupt; so, too, Leo; Brix reads *in Cercopia*, Lindsay in his Oxford text *in Cercopio*, both of course expunging *insula*. (For references to earlier discussions of the verse, cf. *Trinummus*,³ ed. Ritschl-Schoell, appendix critica on vs. 928).

The argument, in addition to the metrical necessity of the change, which leads to the removal of *insula*, is that in the codex vetus B of Plautus the word *insula* has before and after it a dot; this has led to the suspicion that it is a gloss, a suspicion that is naturally strengthened by the fact that the removal of the word helps to make the line metrically correct. The changes which involve a *Cercopia* rest on the fact that *Cecropia*, so far as we know, could refer only to Athens, an unlikely reference even if *insula* is expunged—leaving the verse metrically imperfect—and out of harmony with *Rhadamantem* if that word refers to Rhadamanthus, though this has not been regarded as certain. The change to *Cercopia*,¹ or *Cercopum insula*, has some tangible support: we hear elsewhere of an island of the Cercopes, typical swindlers of

¹ *Cercopia* and *Cecropia* are easily confounded: Hesychius s. v. Κέρκωψ explains Κέρκωψ. A few modern scholars, indeed, connect Cecrops and Cercops: cf. Roscher, *Lex. Myth.* II 1022–3 s. v. *Kekrops*, and the ingenious theory which von Prott has left in outline in his posthumous notes (*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* IX [1906] 89): he thinks Cecrops was a sublimated Cercops.

folk-tale (Lobeck, *Aglaoph.* 1302; Roscher, *Lex. Myth.* II 1166 s. v. Kerkopen), changed into monkeys (Xenagoras ap. Harpocr. s. v. Κέρκωψ, and schol. ad Lucian., p. 181, 6 Rabe; Ovid, *Metam.* XIV 90-100). Such a reference is not inappropriate in the context (cf. Roscher, *Lex. Myth.* II 1172), but if *Rhadamantem* alludes to Rhadamanthus we have no evidence of any association of the judge in the other world with the island of the Cercopes. Such are the difficulties: they led Ostermayer (*De historia fabulari in com. Plaut.* 53-4) to refrain from any interpretation and to express no positive opinion other than that the verse comes directly from the Greek original.

My own study of the passage has not led to any definitive settlement of the reading or of the interpretation, but several new points of view and some fresh evidence seem worthy of consideration. In the first place the seclusion of *insula* by dots in B (note that the same MS has *Cecropio*) may be significant: it is evident that Lindsay would argue that the original reading was *Cercopio*, easily corrupted to *Cecropio*, that *insula* is a gloss transferred to the text, and that *Cecropio* was changed in some MS to *Cecropia* to harmonize with *insula*. This may be a correct explanation of the variant readings, of the hypermetrical verse, and of the dots in B. But, if we admit the possibility of a rather early corruption in the text, our interpretation of its present condition may be very different but equally plausible. The significance of the dots in B is far from certain; a cretic word is too natural an ending of such trochaic verses to be hastily ejected; the dots may be merely an indication of the hypermetrical verse, and of a sensitiveness to metrical accuracy on the part of a careful copyist. At any rate we must leave open the question raised by this peculiarity of one MS.¹

Furthermore, investigation of Greek proper names fails to show the existence of any other word than Rhadamanthus which has the same stem, or at least which is not immediately connected with Rhadamanthus; and the appearance of Rhadamanthus in Utopian fiction, combined with the Utopian atmosphere of the passage, makes it extremely probable that there is no serious corruption in this word, and that no other person is intended in this reference.

Now, once granting the certainty of Rhadamanthus as the person referred to, any reference to the island of the Cercopes

¹ In C, according to the facsimile, *insula* appears at the beginning of the next line, but C does not preserve the division by verses.

becomes extremely improbable; there is no connection between Rhadamanthus and these swindlers of folk-tale in extant allusions to the story, nor is there any point of contact between the two inherent in what we know of either. Add to this that the geographical references in the immediate context are consistently to Arabia or the vicinity,¹ and it becomes clear, to my own mind at least, that if we can find any evidence associating Rhadamanthus with Arabia, it will be reasonable to infer that the phrase *in Cecropio(a)*, or if it be corrupt, whatever once stood in its place, referred to a place imagined to be in the vicinity of Arabia, possibly to an island off the coast.

There does exist evidence of connection between Rhadamanthus and Arabia. The story is earlier than Pliny the Elder (N. H. 6, 158), who, in speaking of Arabian towns and peoples, mentions the Rhadamaei, and says parenthetically: *et horum origo Rhadamantus putatur, frater Minois*; cf. also 157: *Minaei, a rege Cretae Minoe, ut existimant, originem trahentes*. Nonnus, whose indebtedness to Hellenistic sources directly or indirectly is often evident, is more specific (Dionys. 21, 304):

καὶ καλέσας Ῥαδαμᾶνας ἀλῆμονας, οὓς ποτε γαίης
Κρηταίης ἀέκοντας ἀπὸ χθονὸς ἤλασε Μίνως
Ῥῥαβίης ἐπὶ πέζαν, ἐπέφραδε νέυματι Ῥείης
πῆξαι νῆμα δοῦρα θαλάσσιον εἰς μόθον Ἰνδῶν.²

Furthermore, the nominative singular suggested by the form in Nonnus should prevent any conservative editor from changing *Rhadamantem* to *Rhadamantum*. Possibly, however, this same form in Nonnus may lead to a revival of Bothe's original emendation *Rhadamam*; the equation *Calchas*: *Calcham*:: *Rhadamas*: *Rhadamam* may be now complete. When the longer and

¹ Vs. 845 is comprehensive; Seleucia is consistently referred to (112, 771, 901); for Arabia, cf. 933 ff. For Arabia in fiction cf. Diodorus V 41 ff. (above, p. 58). The mention of *Κεδρωσία* in Diodorus V 41 (cf. Ausfeld, *Der griech. Alexanderroman* 168 ff.) suggests that *in Cedrosia* (without *insula*) would be fairly satisfactory from a palaeographical standpoint; but *insula* as a gloss would be unexplained except as a mistaken interpretation, and we have no evidence that Cedrosia was near the part of Arabia inhabited by the mythical or historical Rhadamanes or Rhadamaei of Nonnus or Pliny.

² It is worth noting that in Diodorus's account of Euhemerus's story (above, p. 58), Zeus is said to have led the ancestors of the priests of Triphylian Zeus from Crete to Panchaea, which is located in the ocean off Arabia and Cedrosia, and that the Rhadamanes are led (by Rhadamanthus?) from the same place and to the same general region.

more familiar form was substituted by a copyist, the line became unmetrical, and *insula* was set off by dots to indicate the hyper-metric verse. The original reading would have been

—sed ipse ubi est?—pol illum reliqui ad Rhadamam in Cecropia insula.

Lest anybody should be led by the passage of Nonnus to read

—sed ipse ubi est?—pol illum reliqui ad Rhadaman(t)es in Cecropio.

I should note, first, that the construction with *ad* is not fully substantiated by the examples in Lodge, *Lexicon Plautinum* s. v. *ad* III Significatio I D 2 = Vol. I, fasc. I, p. 39, and, secondly, that the 'Ραδαμάνθους κρίσις is very likely a comic motif (cf. Kock CAF. ἀδέσποτα 731, with the passages referred to).

The ejection of *insula* as a gloss, however, and the reading *Cecropio* from the hand of the careful copyist of B are not to be disregarded in our consideration of the possibilities. The geographical reference in either *Cecropia* or *Cecropio* must remain unsettled. But in addition to the authority of B in favor of *Cecropio*, there is a slight bit of evidence which, I think, has been overlooked. Stephanus of Byzantium s. v. 'Ασσός writes: δευτέρα πόλις Αιολίδος κατὰ τὸν 'Ελλάσποντον, ἥ Κεκρόπειον. Now Plautus might turn Κεκρόπειον into *Cecropëum* (Buecheler, Rh. Mus. 41 [1886] 311-313), or even into *Cecropium*, if *Seleucia* represents Σελεύχεια. As a place-name, then, *Cecropium* is not impossible. To accommodate this name the verse must then be read with hiatus and lengthening of the final syllable of *Rhadamantem*:

—sed ipse ubi est?—pol illum reliqui ad Rhadamantem | in Cecropio.

Of such "hiatus mit Längung" Maurenbrecher quotes nineteen examples from the MSS (Hiatus u. Verschleifung im alten Latein, p. 56-7). Whatever may be said against hiatus of this particular sort, it should be noted that in this verse there is special occasion for it: the effect is much enhanced by a long pause after *Rhadamantem*, followed by the unsatisfactory solution of the mystery in the Utopian reference.

I find myself prepared by this study of the various factors to accept without essential change the reading of the copyist of B, and to reject *insula* as a gloss. If the hiatus is ever proved to be an insuperable obstacle, the reading *Rhadamam* and the retention of *insula* may become more desirable. But in either case it seems to me that no conservative editor should change *Cecropio(a)* to

Cercopio(a), or should for a moment question that the reference in Rhadamantem is to the judge of the other world, and that the form of his name comes from a nominative *Rhadamas*.

3

There is at least one other passage in Plautus that has not hitherto been included among these Utopian references. The *Asinaria* opens with a scene in which Demaenetus crosses the stage conducting his slave Libanus. The slave with comical insistence demands that his master shall bind himself by the most solemn oaths to answer his approaching question with absolute veracity. After the required pledges have been given the slave's question is forthcoming and turns out to be simply (31 ff.):

num me illuc ducis ubi lapis lapidem terit?

The conversation continues with a request from the master for enlightenment and with the slave's solution of the riddle:

quid istuc est? aut ubi istuc est terrarum loci?
 —ubi flent nequam homines qui polentam pinsitant,
 apud fustitudinas ferricrepinas insulas,
 ubi vivos homines mortui incursant boves.
 —modo pol percepi, Libane, quid istuc sit loci:
 ubi fit polenta, te fortasse dicere.

If Demaenetus had left the riddle unexplained, a reader of Plautus would have no difficulty in discovering its meaning. We are not dependent upon this passage alone for evidence that the slave dreaded the task of turning the hand-mill, and that he was chained to his work and clubbed into faithful performance of his duty; nor is the curious periphrasis in vs. 35, by which the leathern whips are somewhat clumsily suggested, at all foreign to Plautus's style.

There is only one lineament in the comic picture that makes one pause: why is this place of torture referred to as the Club-bruisian Ironrattlian *Islands*?

So far as I know, the only effort to account for *insulas* is in the commentary of Ussing on the play: "*insulas molas appellat in pistrino positas, similitudinem rei, ut ex Pompeianis molis apparet, egregie secutus*". If one contents himself with accepting Ussing's view and does not consult the pictures of Pompeian mills, a picture of a simple upper and nether mill-stone rises in one's mind, and by fancying the upper stone as much smaller than the nether, one derives a satisfactory idea of a veritable island in mid-ocean. The hand-mills found in Pompeii, however, do not

so readily suggest islands. In shape like an hour-glass they rest on bases of varying size and form, but usually of the same diameter as the bottom of the hour-glass; underneath mill and basis is a circular pedestal of greater diameter so that the pedestal extends beyond the mill itself on all sides, not however so far in proportion to the height of the mill as to suggest clearly the ocean surrounding an island.¹ It is not certain that Ussing has in mind the separate mills; from his "in pistrino positas" we may infer that he thinks of a number of such mills disposed in a spacious room like islands dotting the surface of the ocean. That this picture may have been in the poet's mind cannot be denied; it may very well have been part of the concrete experience from which he fashions the description in our passage.² My only contention is that an equally important element in the creation is purely fanciful, and that the combination of concrete experience and vivid fancy contributes a large part of the comic effect produced by the description. The fanciful element in the compound was probably suggested by Plautus's Greek source; the realistic element is largely Roman,³ as is clear from the peculiarly Plautine and Latin adjectives *fustitudinae ferricrepinae*. Certainly an effective incongruity arises from the mingling of a very realistic place of punishment with imaginary islands, probably of perfect peace and happiness. The possibility of such a combination will receive some support if the features of the description harmonize with characteristics of Utopian islands; primarily, of course, they will harmonize with the purely realistic experience in the poet's mind: for we should not forget that the poet had himself worked at the mill (*pace* Leo, Pl. Forsch. 61 ff.).

Some of these features may be described negatively as not inconsistent with what we are told about Utopia in other literature. Such, for example, are the dead oxen that attack living men. Utopia is regularly inhabited by paradoxical animals.⁴ Further-

¹ Daremberg-Saglio, Dictionnaire s. v. mola, reproduce a mill that rests in a broad basin and very well suggests an island. For the Pompeian mills cf. Overbeck-Mau, Pompeii⁴ 385-387, Blümner, Technologie I 27.

² The phrasing reminds one of *fui praeferratus apud molas tribunus vapularis* (Pers. 22), and cf. Ps. 1100.

³ The realistic element may have been suggested by the Greek original: cf. Herondas V 32, and the passages quoted from the lexicographers by Crusius (ed. minor,⁴ p. 44); also Hermann-Blümner, Privatalt. 90, n. 7.

⁴ Our sources of information are secondary, and usually simply state that paradoxical animals were a part of the Utopian fiction: so in Aelian, V. H. III

more, Utopia is often identical with the unknown land that receives us after death, and features of terrestrial and aerial Utopias recur in the subterranean *Schlaraffenland* of Hades:¹ grewsome animals in general,² and oxen in particular,³ are characteristic of the underworld Utopia. The forceful antithesis in *ubi vivos homines mortui* incursant boves might harmonize very well with the visits of living men to this Utopian Hades⁴ which were so commonly reported in Hellenistic fiction, both secular and religious, as well as in the older literature. To prevent misunderstanding let me repeat that I do not contend that such points of contact with the Utopias of contemporary fiction and *Volksphantasie* were at all prominent in the poet's mind, but only that the connotation of *insulas* brought about necessarily a certain consistency with the features of the Utopian islands familiar to the poet and instantly associated with *insulas*.

The fanciful names "Clubbruishian, Ironrattlian", so far as they are fanciful, would certainly not be at odds with the Utopian element in *insulas*.⁵

18 of Theopompus's story, Diodorus V 45 of Euhemerus's Panchaea. Diodorus II 58 gives more details, especially about the curious tortoise-like animals, in reporting the adventures of Iambulus; the fanciful creations of Lucian's parody show how constant a feature of Utopia such creatures must have been in Hellenistic fiction: the oxen with horns under their eyes (V. H. II 3) and the horned ox-men, Bucephali (II 44), are in point.

¹ Dieterich, *Nekyia* 25: Als die Vorstellung von dem Totenreich unter der Erde herrschend war, wurden alle jene Herrlichkeiten auch in die Tiefe verlegt, und so hat es ja die attische Komödie so gern dargestellt. Ihr sonnig heiteres Schlaraffenland ist drunten im düsteren Hades.

² Radermacher, *Das Jenseits im Mythos d. Hellenen* 106 ff.

³ Dieterich, *op. cit.* 25, n. 1, refers to the cattle of Helios appearing later in Hades, to Geryoneus and his herd on Erytheia, to Persephone *βομφόρβη*, and to the primitive conception of the god of death as a herdsman. An interesting fragment from Pherecrates's *Κραπαταλοί* (82 K.) is pertinent; the speaker, a toothless old man, complains that no knife has been put in his kit so that he may eat his beef in Hades:

μάχαيران ἄρ' ἐνέθηκας;—ὄν.—τί μ' εἰργασαι;
ἀμάχαρος ἐπὶ βόεια νοστήσω κρέα,
ἀνὴρ γέρων, ἀνόδοντος;

⁴ Note the question addressed to Lucian by Rhadamanthus in the island of the blessed (V. H. II 10): ὁ μὲν ἤρετο τί παθόντες ἐτι ζῶντες ἱεροῦ χωρίου ἐπιβαίμεν. Similarly the speaker in a fragment of Ameipsias (23 K.): εἰ μὴ (so the MSS) θανοῦσιν ἔστι τις τιμὴ κάτω, | καταβῶμεν.

⁵ The names, realistically suggesting actual experience, cannot be precisely paralleled, but the range of names in Lucian suggests that the Plautine adjectives would find congenial company in Hellenistic fiction.

There is a certain measure of positive evidence of affinity with folk-notions of Utopia, or more precisely with the phraseology current in ordinary speech in reference to *Nirgendheim*. This evidence appears in the phrase that introduces the whole discussion: num me illuc ducis ubi lapis lapidem terit? In popular usage this where-formula with its paradoxical content introduced references to the land of Nowhere: the evidence is naturally scanty, as is the case with most of the material bearing on folklore in ancient Greece. Crusius in his admirable discussion of Herondas 3, 74-76 (Untersuchungen zu d. Mimiamben d. Herondas 71 ff.) has collected the pertinent material without including our passage. In Herondas the relentless school-master exclaims to the incorrigible youngster whom he is flogging:

ἀλλ' εἰς πονηρός, Κότταλ', ὥστε καὶ περνᾷς
οὐδεὶς σ' ἐπαινέσειεν, οὐδ' ὅκως χάρηξ
οἱ μὲν ὁμοίως τὸν σίδηρον τρώγουσιν.

This particular phrase meets us later in Latin literature in Seneca's Apocolocyntosis Divi Claudii, in which the emperor on reaching the other world is told that he has come to the place *ubi mures ferrum rodunt* (7).¹ The identification of Utopia with the realm of Hades (which we noted above in another connection) appears again, and expressed in a similar formula, in Callimachus; apparently posing as a Hipponax returned from the dead, the speaker exclaims (Frgs. 92, 85):

ἀκούσασθ' Ἰππώνακτος· οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' ἦκω
ἐκ τῶν ὅκων βοῦν κολλύβου πιπρήσκουσιν.²

¹ Amusing attempts to locate the land where mice gnaw iron may be found in the ancient writers: Rose, Pseudepigraphus 334 ff.

² The cheapness of things is a stock feature of *Schlaraffenland*: gold is less valuable to the inhabitants of Theopompus's Utopia than iron to ordinary folk (Aelian, V. H. III 18). An interesting parallel to the verses of Callimachus occurs in an epigram by the same author (13 Wil.) if we accept Kaibel's interpretation of Πελλαίου in the last verse as meaning a drachma of Pella and so corresponding to κολλύβου in the fragment above; the epigram represents a passer-by as conversing first with the tombstone, then with the shade of the deceased, who is called up from the dead:

ἦ ῥ' ὑπὸ σοὶ Χαρίδας ἀναπαύεται;—εἰ τὸν Ἀρίμμη
τοῦ Κυρηναίου παῖδα λέγεις, ὑπ' ἐμοί.
—ὦ Χαρίδα, τί τὰ νέρθε;—πολὺς σκότος.—αἱ δ' ἀνοδοὶ τί;
—ψευδός.—ὁ δὲ Πλούτων;—μῖθος.—ἀπωλόμεθα.
—οὗτος ἐμὸς λόγος ἡμῶν ἀληθινός· εἰ δὲ τὸν ἡδὺν
βοῦλει· Πελλαίου βοῦς μέγας εἰν Ἀΐδη.

In Hipponax, the model of Herondas and Callimachus, Crusius thinks we should find many such phrases if more of his verses were preserved. One more example of this where-formula Crusius has recovered from a proverb quoted in Aristotle, *Hist. Anim.* IX 161 b: *ὅπου αἱ ἔλαφοι τὰ κέρατα ἀποβάλλουσιν*. Aristotle explains by saying that the deer cast off their horns *ἐν τόποις χαλεποῖς καὶ δυσέ-ευρέτοις*. But, as Crusius points out, inasmuch as the female of the deer have no horns to lose, we have here another reference to *Nirgendheim*. Our own verse, it seems to me, is but an echo or parody of this where-formula referring to Utopia.¹

It may with some fitness be objected that the Utopian formula is still appropriate if the *insulae* are the mills: yet the association of the where-formula and of *insulae* with Utopia seems to me to make the interpretation which I have suggested for *insulae* almost inevitable; after the hearer has once heard the mysterious formula that from constant usage must have called up in his mind at once the idea of *Nirgendheim*, the islands in question could hardly escape being identified with the islands of fancy. Nor should we expect our author to miss the opportunity for such an effective incongruity as results from the mental juxtaposition of a place of perfect torture and islands of blessed peace and happiness. These are the *Infortunatorum Insulae*.

4

The evidence of Philemon's interest in Utopias is by no means so complete that we should hastily ascribe to him every Utopian reference in Plautus.² In noting, however, a Utopian passage

The consciousness of the mythical character of the under-world *Schlaraffenland*—a mere *ἡδυστογία*—is expressed with fine irony (Reitzenstein, *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen* 19, and n. 1, 2). For the interpretation, cf. Kaibel, *Hermes* 31 (1896) 265.

¹ I have not included much that may be pertinent if we restore the where-formula from many references in proverbs and other literature to the land "where asses and wolves fly through the air, where he-goats are milked and cows are saddled": for such material cf. Crusius, *Verh. d. Versamml. deutsch. Philolog. u. Schulmänner* 40 (1889) 36 ff. The where-formula naturally became stereotyped in such proverbial phrases as Petronius's *facile est autem ubi omnia quadrata currunt*, and the paradoxical idea without the "where" is very frequent, as in Petronius's *dices hic porcos coctos ambulare*. From such colloquial phrases and proverbs Crusius reconstructs a great many features of *Schlaraffenland* as the Greeks and Romans conceived it.

² Least of all a mere reference to "islands" such as we have just discussed in the *Asinaria*. Yet I may be forgiven for reminding myself and others that Demophilus, to whom the original of the *Asinaria* is ascribed in the prologue

from the Aulularia, we may well bear in mind that Blass ascribes to Philemon the fragments in the recently edited Hibeh papyri which are supposed to be from the Greek original of the Aulularia.¹ The lines are spoken by a slave after he has secured possession of a pot of gold (701-702):

Picis divitiis, qui aureos montis colunt,
ego solus supero.

The full treatment of the passage by Fleckeisen in JHB. 143 (1891) 657 ff. makes further discussion unnecessary.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

(vs. 11), is otherwise unknown (but cf. Fleckeisen, JHB. 97 [1868] 213; also Bergk, Rh. Mus. 34 [1880] 313; Wilhelm, Urkunden Dramatischer Aufführungen 128), and that in earlier days efforts were made to substitute *Diphilus* for *Demophilus* (cf. Asin. ed. Goetz-Schoell, praef. XIX and *apparatus criticus* on vs. 11; Ritschl, Opusc. II 683 n.***). Certainly as much (perhaps no more!) may be said for substituting *Philemo*, especially as the substitution requires no further changes to suit the metre, as the change to *Diphilus* does. The striking similarity between the prologues of the Trinummus and of the Asinaria (especially Asin. 8-12 and Trin. 16-21, in which the points of resemblance cannot be paralleled from other prologues: cf. Leo, Pl. Forsch. 181-183) cannot of course be used as evidence, for these passages came from Plautus or a later source; but the similarity is more easily explained if there is an association of ideas formed by the fact that the Greek author of the two plays is the same person. Nor is the dissimilarity between the two Latin plays an argument against common authorship, though a careful study might reveal in style or in structure positive evidence for or against common authorship. There is, however, not the slightest trace of corruption in vs. 11 of the prologue, so that the error, if there was one, arose early in the transmission of the text, and all traces of it disappeared. Did an original *pilemo* become *deipilemo* (cf. *deicam* of the previous verse) and then *deimopile* or *demopile*, and so *demophilus*? Or is the present reading a survival of disputed authorship resulting in the fusion of the names of the two claimants, Diphilus and Philemon: they are mentioned together in Most. 1149, and the reading has suffered in a way that may suggest possibilities in our own verse—*dephilo aut philomontes*.

¹Cf. Leo, Hermes 41 (1906) 629, and Blass's rejoinder, Rh. Mus. 62 (1907) 102.